

# ***SCAAC Meeting Summary and Minutes***

## ***(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)***

January 16, 2004  
State Board Room  
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

### **Committee Members:**

Margie T. Bradford	Eleanor Mills	Roxie R. Tempus
Kay Freeland	Henry Ormsby	J. Maynard Thomas, Vice-Chairman
Suzanne Guyer	Roger Pankratz	
Varetta D. Hurt	Robert Sexton	
Benny Lile, Chairman	Linda Sheffield	
Gary Mielcarek	H. M. Snodgrass	Three (3) Open Positions

### **SCAAC Agenda**

	<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Presenters</b>
	<b>Call to Order</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Roll Call</b>	<b>Roger Ervin</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Approval of Minutes from September 12, 2003 and November 14, 2003 Meetings</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Vacant Committee positions – status report</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Concept Paper</b>	<b>Gene Wilhoit</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Update on NCLB Regulations</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Writing Portfolio and On-Demand Writing Statistics</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>NCLB Results</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>703 KAR 5:040 – Accountability for Students A1-A6</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>

9.	<b>Status of NCLB Required Reading and Mathematics questions, grades 3-8</b> <b>a) Augmented NRT</b> <b>b) Longitudinal Assessment</b> <b>c) New National Forms</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>Adjournment</b>		

*Presenters:*

Cindy Owen, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education  
Scott Trimble, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education  
Gene Wilhoit, Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Education

*In Attendance:*

Kentucky Department of Education: Jennifer Bernhard, Cherry Boyles, Roger Ervin, Phyllis Shuttleworth, Robin Thompson  
Kentucky Education Association (KEA): Sharon Felty Comer  
Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability: Gerald Lunney  
Pritchard Committee for Academic Excellence: Cindy Heine

**Call to Order****Benny Lile**

Chairperson Benny Lile greeted members at 9:03 a.m.

Benny Lile asked members their opinion on membership quorum. Benny advised that this committee has always operated on the basis of a quorum the way most organizations do where half (1/2) of the membership is required to be present. Legislatively the committee has seventeen (17) members. Currently there are 14 active members. The committee might want to consider a definition of quorum being half of the active membership. He is unaware of any organization that could operate if a quorum had to be half of potential membership. This committee has been operating under half of potential membership. With three open positions there are fourteen (14) active members; half of that seven (7) would give us a quorum. Benny is prepared to move forward unless he hears disagreement from the members present. The purpose of a quorum is to keep just a few people from coming together and transacting business. Benny indicated that we currently have half of our active body present.

H.M. Snodgrass advised that he does not have a problem as this is a logical approach.

Benny Lile asked that the minutes show that the committee quorum is one-half of the active members and that there is a quorum present.

**1. Roll Call****Roger Ervin**

With a quorum of council members present, the meeting was called to order at 9:12 a.m. The membership roll was called with the following nine members were present:

Margie T. Bradford  
Kay Freeland  
Suzanne Guyer

Benny Lile  
Eleanor Mills  
Henry Ormsby

Robert Sexton  
Linda Sheffield  
H. M. Snodgrass

**2****Approval of Minutes from September 12, 2003 and  
November 14, 2003 Meetings****Benny Lile**

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile presented to the committee members the minutes from the September 2003 and November 2003 committee meetings and asked members to review them.

Linda Sheffield asked that the minutes reflect her attendance at the September meeting.

## **SCAAC MOTION**

Margie Bradford made the motion that the two sets of minutes stand approved as presented. The motion was seconded by H. M. Snodgrass. All in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). Motion passed as presented.

<b>3</b>	<b>Vacant Committee positions – status report</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
----------	---	-------------------

### **SCAAC member comments:**

Benny Lile advised members on the status of the committee's open position. Benny emailed Keith Hall, Governor Fletcher's contact for Boards and Appointments. Benny also plans to make contact with Secretary Virginia Fox next week. Eleanor Mills is working with the Principals group on recommendations for the two open positions. The other open position is a Board Member.

### **KDE staff comments:**

Commissioner Gene Wilhoit indicated that he has had conversations with Virginia Fox and they are moving forward as quickly as possible.

### **SCAAC member comments:**

Kay Freeland asked the committee if a motion was needed on our quorum?

Benny Lile agreed that would be in order.

## **SCAAC MOTION**

Kay Freeland moved that since this committee is functioning under three vacant positions that quorum be reflected as one-half (1/2) of the present committee membership. The motion was seconded by H. M. Snodgrass. All in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). The motion carried.

<b>4</b>	<b>Concept Paper</b>	<b>Gene Wilhoit</b>
----------	----------------------	---------------------

### **KDE staff comments:**

Commissioner Gene Wilhoit handed out a more current paper that summarizes the content paper.

Gene appreciates the opportunity to have this conversation with the committee to talk about our goals.

In the last year or so there have been a number of different themes and perspectives that have come forward about where we are in terms of progress in Kentucky and where we need to go and what particular struggles people are having to try to meet the goals. Very few people say that the course that we have set is not appropriate for us. People are committed to improving achievement for all children. It is the struggle to get there that we must continue to analyze, evaluate and adjust accordingly. The paper is a result of hearing people talk.

The Commissioner would like to give the members a sense of some of the directions that are being thought about. Gene Wilhoit would deeply appreciate the thoughts the committee members had about whether we are on target or if there is something missing at this point in time in our initiative. Gene Wilhoit is seeking this group's guidance in terms of future directions in the department.

The short paper is called enhancing assessment and accountability. The reason that there are several items on the sheet that do not directly fit under the title of assessment is obvious. If we develop an assessment system that is disconnected from the teaching and learning process from the other important variables that we have in place in the system, then we are going to perpetuate continued isolation of the statewide assessment and accountability from classroom practices. That is where a lot of Gene Wilhoit's concerns rest right now. After a number of years what is our honest assessment of where we are in terms of moving practice to the level that we all perceive that it needs to be. An honest assessment is that we have one of the best high stakes accountability systems in the country. We get verification of that from virtually every sort of report that is put in place. What this committee has done over the past few years is working to make improvements in that system as we moved ahead.

We also have to assess where are the teachers in the classroom in terms of current practice against where we are trying to move. Gene Wilhoit's assessment at this point is that some of the best teachers in isolation have been able to do this with a lot of hard work. That is to align current practice, curricular design and instructional practice and assessment practices in the classroom with where we have a vision that they should move. Some of our school districts with a lot of hard work have been able to accomplish a comprehensive system wide system of instructing children. There are lots of gaps in the system. We have a lot of teaching that is not consistent with what we want our children to learn. There are still a lot of teachers that are still struggling with good intent because they do not have the time, the knowledge and the skills to get to where we have asked them to go. We also have a lot of systems that are struggling to provide the appropriate resources around our teachers. Gene Wilhoit is not making those statements to condemn anything we have done. Gene feels that we have done a marvelous job of moving toward the goal. It is important for us from time to time to step back and to evaluate what we need to do next. This is an attempt to do so. If this assessment of where we are, where we need to go

is out of alignment with this committee's perception of where we need to go then that is the important conversation that we need to have. Gene is beginning to think about the ways to marshal the resources in the state to get some of these things done.

Our assessment is that we have at this time a lot of people spending considerable energy working on things that could be done at a more centralized level than they are right now. We do have many schools engaged in activities that are not benefiting from what we know, from research and practice. This is an attempt to say we are going to engage in if appropriate tremendous effort to pull together what we now know and get that into the hands of teachers in classrooms.

What we have determined to be some of those things that we perceive are missing are:

Incrementally placed multiple documents. There are eleven (11) different documents that have come out of the Department of Education over the last few years that tell people what the curriculum ought to be {*Language, IGP, Experiences, Culture, PSP, IEP, Needs, Learning Styles, Interests, GSSP, Student Data Tool*}. They might not tell you in a comprehensive way what that curriculum is but they tell you what a piece of it might be and some of them are attempts either in a general context or in a more specific context tell teachers what they ought to know and to teach. Think of the life of a teacher today. We are asking them to consider curriculum from 11 different documents. These are in the minds of teachers as they begin to think about how they address an individual child. Is there a way that we can put that together into a cohesive tool that will help teachers and with that tool teachers would be able to go to a resource based help aid?

These are eleven different documents that have not been connected. Teachers come to the Commissioner and say that they are frustrated, he can understand that very well. We are in the process of putting the eleven documents together into one coherent document that can be accessed by teachers so that all of this makes sense. If it doesn't then we will remove the clutter that is there for a lot of the teachers.

Assessments. As we go out and observe classrooms the assessments that are being used by teachers in classrooms often are different from the assessments that the students take on state examinations. We still find a disconnect. In an attempt to rectify this situation the practice has been to stop instruction and coach students on the CATS assessment. We are also observing in the classroom the teachers will go through the regular instructional process which is not aligned and in the middle of that they will stop and give a CATS exercise out of the context of what is being taught in the classroom. None of those are good practice. In desperation and without guidance those are things that teachers would do to correct deficits that they perceive in the classroom.

Is there some way that we can provide some guidance; not direction? What does a 4<sup>th</sup> grade mathematics curriculum look like? How would one divide the content and skills required of a 4<sup>th</sup> grade mathematics teacher into an orderly sequence of instruction process. We are calling them Units of Study. They are not lessons, they are large blocks of

instructional content that can be put together in a sequence or program that teachers might use as a reference point. Gene Wilhoit credits Roger Pankratz with getting the department to address this issue. We are finding that what is happening in the classroom is not connected to what they should learn. There may be exciting and fun things going on that are not connected to what students should know or be able to do. Nor are they connected to a orderly sequence of learning. Our attempt is to put that in place and there are some places in the Commonwealth that have done this very well and we are gathering that.

Teachers cannot define proficient work. If you look at the grades, we are finding an inverse relationship between good teaching and the knowledge base about proficiency and poor teaching. Our teachers who have the lowest expectations generally are getting the lowest performance scales on the CATS assessments. There is a misalignment on what is judged proficient in the regular classroom and what is judged proficient on our statewide assessments. Many of the teachers have not seen or been able to analyze proficient work. One thing we plan to provide that we have not in the past is some actual student responses to examination questions notated to the point where we can pinpoint the differences between proficient and non-proficient work.

Test Item Database. Teachers do not have a database of test items from which to choose. Our concern about that is the database itself, the item data bank being given out to teachers is of little importance if it is not connected to the Units of Study. You could have some very good questions but if they are not connected to any sort of order or sequence of learning then you can do more damage than good. We are talking about developing a set of open response items. We have begun a conversation with several school districts. Jefferson is taking on the lead responsibility. Fayette has joined and Davies is joining. We are finding a great deal of excitement. We are about to create in the state a database of test items that can be pulled down in the context of Units of Study and used by teachers either in ways that they could see necessary or in a orderly sequence of programming.

Gene Wilhoit asked why we have not done this before? Gene believes it has not become apparent until the last couple of years that these are the missing gaps. The pique pro quo originally, the contract that was sort of signed was that the state set the standard and the field will deliver. What was missing is the support base in between those two ends of the continuum.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield felt that teachers are going to be ecstatic to get more items that are actually tied into core content. Linda was just reviewing items for the National Council of Teachers in Mathematics. They are coming up with exemplary items with rubrics matched to every bullet on the new NTCM standards.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit is in communication through the Council of Chief State School Officers about other states who have similar accountability systems coming together to share these items.

There is going to be a lot of support from a lot of other efforts to help us put this item bank together.

Scott Trimble advises that the department has staff beginning to look at the NAEP release items.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield asked if there is something being done to match the assessment at the high school mathematics with the program of studies? The program of studies does not go beyond algebra and geometry.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit responded that this probably is our most intense conversation right now. This is coming out of our P16 work. We are trying to make sure our system is aligned. The other conversation is mathematics and the core content.

We still do not agree about what mathematics is at the elementary and secondary level with higher education? We have done a pretty good job in the language arts conversations, but in mathematics we still have a disconnect. There is a great appreciation for algebra at the post secondary level. There is not a great appreciation for probability and statistics. Some of the national reports are fairly contradictory to what is now being offered at the post secondary level. The analysis is showing that algebra and geometry are used much less in the job performance level than probabilities and statistics and other kinds of work. Do we put in place an aligned curriculum that is irrelevant to the work task of the future? We are trying to get the people from the workforce to weigh in on this issue on job and mathematics skills. Mathematics is probably the most unresolved content area in Kentucky right now.

SCAAC member comments:

H.M. Snodgrass indicated that as we begin to move closer to 2014, the pressures will continue to grow exponentially on the system itself. Refinements will have to be made. This is an excellent direction and had we seen this four or five years ago we would have been in a much better position to get to proficiency by 2014. Refinements, validity of tests, credibility all kinds of issues will grow larger and larger.

H.M. Snodgrass does not have a problem with a standardized or state level curriculum that is made available to districts in some of these areas. Districts can choose to do it or not. Chances are better that they will be successful if they will have standard measuring stick from which to develop things. This is the right direction and the faster we can move on this the better off everyone will be.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit feels that these conversations really test our underlying belief systems about how things best happen. Making any decision, we ought to be thinking about relying on those people at the classroom level who are at a point of delivery to do what they can do.



Gene Wilhoit has been reluctant to do what North Carolina did which was to put out the state curriculum. Then Gene looks at North Carolina's progress over the last few years. He has talked to the people there and they say one of the things that really allowed them to align quickly was to define very precisely what they wanted taught in the classroom. Gene feels that they went overboard in terms, on Thursday this is what you are teaching.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland shared that Rowan Co. has taken the last six years and has aligned their curriculum. This has cost hundreds of thousands of dollars not only in money but in teacher time. The thing Rowan Co. is going to need help with are instructional strategies and test bank of items. We are seeing a great turnover of teachers and we have so many new teachers that can not take material and do with it like an experienced teacher can.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit advised that the strategies and Units of Work will model units against the curriculum and will address how one organizes a classroom, how one sets up a classroom, the learning process and how one concludes a classroom.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland advised that Rowan Co for the last 6 years has been allowing teachers to develop those plans. The legislature is cutting that money so we will not be able to do that. We will need help from the state.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit pointed out that going into the next cycle one can project a lot of teachers will retire. Anywhere from 20% to 25% of our teachers are eligible to retire in the next couple of years, they have decided not to that over the last couple of years because of the incentive programs that are in the retirement system. If the teachers see a budget that has level funding, is that going to have a negative impact on workforce retention? Gene feels that it probably will and it makes it even more important that we are able to help with those new teachers.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked what North Carolina has done at the high school. Have they taken it to the secondary level?

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit responded that they have. North Carolina has not modified the curriculum dramatically. If you are a teacher in North Carolina and you are teaching history, there is a syllabus. They have end of course assessments that correlate to that. Gene is still reluctant to go all the way to mandating that you sit down and teach that curriculum.

Gene Wilhoit pointed out another thing that many of the states have done is introduced end of course exams at the secondary level.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield felt that we can not expect classroom teachers to be able to write high level or inquiry based kinds of assessment. Linda has worked with experts at the international level and they try to write good items and then have rewritten them hundreds of times. It is a huge problem.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit talked about his experience in school and teachers writing items. This creates a tremendous amount of pressure on the faculty. Gene feels that it is beyond the capacity of a faculty. Teachers can quickly define the content areas that need to be assessed. But getting to the level of intellectual response that is necessary is the difficult task.

Gene Wilhoit advised that the department plans to provide some help. We are on a timeline to get some of the Units of Study out this year. We will start with mathematics and reading.

Gene Wilhoit then talked about the second area around the learning compact. The compact is partially responsive and also an attempt to plug some of the gaps. Politicians want to solve problems and they want to do it quickly and in a way that is most obvious. In the last session there was a bill that came forward that would have had Kentucky insert in its assessment system a graduation test. This would have been state developed, state administered and students pass or fail. Why would something like that come up in Kentucky? This is a response to the ongoing concern that many people are expressing. Whether it is real or not, the assumption is that we have a number of students that moving through the system without the skills they need to be successful. There is all kinds of public information that validates this claim. Remediation rates, mathematics at the post secondary level, stories anecdotal as they may be still float around.

Some in the legislature were even proposing that we administer at the end elementary school and also at middle school. If they are not able to pass the test then they cannot move to middle school or high school. Our teachers are kind of in support of that. When one sits down with middle school teachers many are saying that if only those primary teachers would give us better students. High school teachers say the same about middle school students. A lot of this is not documented in hard facts and reality, but the perception is out there and it comes around every legislative session.

Gene Wilhoit feels that we do not want a public policy where the state sets a score level, you administer a state test and if the kid does not pass it they do not move on. This is bad public policy. There are so many down falls. What we need to do is due diligence for every Kentucky child. You are going to see a set of initiatives that the department is thinking about *{in outline}*.

Gene Wilhoit has asked the early childhood community to come together. These are the preschool providers and the primary people and give a set of principles that ought to be used in early diagnose of children. If any child enters an education experience in the commonwealth they ought to be offered a diagnostic test to determine where they are against the learning goals that we are setting. Not for evaluative purposes again but for instructional purposes. Every child entering a kindergarten program ought to have one of those tests. In most cases we do. But children entering a preschool program should also have an assessment process. As children move from one setting to another diagnostic tests should be in place so that teachers can then prescribe instructional programs. They childhood community thinks that they can do this in a relatively short period of time. We are expecting a set of principles that ought to be adhered to by teachers who are receiving students. Here are a group of assessments that seem to meet those kinds of principles.

Then you have the issue of how you monitor student progress as they move through the learning experience. We are looking at some way to provide some incentive that if a student is scoring and we want to use our statewide assessment as a beginning point for a set of activities that would occur. The two chairs, the Senate education chair and house education chair are both interested in this concept. If you have children that do not perform well as they are moving from elementary level, Novice on our performance assessment, then test them on the instruments that you have and prescribe some program. For the students that do not show up, we are also thinking about some change in compulsory attendance when there is an agreement between the schools and the parents of the child.

Gene Wihoit hopes that this is a much better way of dealing with this issue of catching kids and premeditating those kids as they work their way through the education process.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland indicated that when kindergarten was first mandated in the 1976 1977 time period the state started an initiative called KIK. Up until two or three years ago, Rowan Co was still giving the KIK assessment. It evaluates every incoming student's physical ability, motor coordination skills, prerequisite skills as well as their verbal capabilities.

Eleanor Mills talked about the Dibbles assessment.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit responded that the new Reading First legislation is going to require that kind of diagnose for youngsters and Dibbles is one that is referenced in the federal legislation. Gene has looked at the assessment and he suspects that will be very cumbersome to administer. First you have to work a manual and a teacher administering must read the manual, have to ask the question, observe the child, record the response and keep the time.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills advised that they do a school of 580 students in one week. The beauty of the program is you can train class side people and parent volunteers and and a class can be

done in 20 minutes. The program is cost effective at \$1.00 per child every year. The efficiency is better than what it initially appears to be.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit is talking with outside technology experts about doing a Palm assessment for Dibbles. This will take the timing components and it becomes much easier to record findings. Gene Wilhoit is telling Superintendents and Principals that don't use CATS an absolute, use it as a trigger for further action. If child comes back on the CATS assessment with a novice or low apprentice kind of response, what are schools doing.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile indicated that it is frustrating, part is that there is a disconnect of when results are available in October and school is focusing on the curriculum and assessment at the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, and not the results from the 4<sup>th</sup> grade. Granted the skills and abilities that probably lead to the student being novice should not be a surprise. It is not triggering action because the results not turned around in a quick enough time and the difference in the content.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit advised that the intent is to be more consistent, exposure to content across every grade. The assessment causes instructional process to be shifted and emphasized in certain years.

SCAAC member comments:

Suzanne Guyer feels that assessment has to be ongoing through out the year. The CATS assessment results only confirms what you did was on track or tells you as a teacher that they were instructionally not on target.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit has heard that there is a need for other assessments, not just CATS results.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills believes that continuous assessments are needed as the teacher needs to assess the student on a daily, weekly and monthly basis. Eleanor talked about intervention and they are working with Murray State for secondary reading skills.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit asked if teachers have ongoing assessments available?

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills indicated a Yes to Gene Wilhoit's question.

Kay Freeland talked about high school reading scores. Students can read but they can not do technical reading. Most of our secondary teachers graduated without having to take a reading course.

Henry Ormsby commented on total learning compact. The compact calls for increased student responsibility and increased parent responsibility. Henry's perception is that the current system places the burden of responsibility on teachers. This has created frustration over the last few years. Henry doesn't believe teachers can be responsible in a vacuum. They are a part of a team at the school level and at the system level and there are responsibilities there that need to be measured. The transition point assessments are critical.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit feels that is important to insert into the system, is legislative to give districts greater authority to prescribe interventions that kids are not ready to move to the next level. We will be able to provide some tools that can be used to mix measurements against hard goals.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield wants to make sure that we do not lose site of the fact that our system needs to move all levels forward, not just the Novice student. We also need to look at moving the top students forward as well. It is awfully easy to lose site of that, especially with No Child Left Behind.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit advised that we are beginning to get indicators of scholars that we did not have a few years ago. Something is happening in the system to begin to produce some outstanding individuals. There is not enough of them and that will be our next test. How do you get more children into that top category. This past year there has been three perfect scores on SAT. Our students are beginning to compete on national writing exams and we had five distinguished last year out of the nation. That is disproportional to our population. When we look at overall assessments, NAEP for example, we do not have enough of them in that highest category.

Gene Wilhoit then began a conversation on what do we do with assessment and accountability system directly in the next few years? It is going to require a lot of conversion but where Gene is coming from in terms of perspective is that there are some issues that have to be addressed as we move ahead. Gene is looking at it from the 10,000 foot level looking down and is dealing with either misperceptions, inappropriate practices, or lack of support coming out of the system right now.

Some of the things we are seeing are:

We have to find as a byproduct of this system some way for a teacher to see the results as soon as possible. By the time the results come back they are not meaningful to the critical decisions that are being made. The only way Gene sees doing that down the road is for us to begin think about moving from paper and pencil to some sort of technology administration. This opens up all kinds of issues. Do we have the technology in the

schools to set up and administer a testing program? Do we have a security system in place that will allow us to maintain a secure test and administer the test in a secure way.

Gene Wilhoit feels that if we do not begin to shift towards some sort of technology based administration we are going to close down many options we have for supporting the teaching and learning process. We may not be able to give all results back immediately. But certainly on the multiple choice part of this we should be able to provide immediate results back to the teacher. The results are farmed up to the state of Kentucky for the department to do what we need to do for state accountability purposes. What you do instructionally with those results is being as critical as what we do for accountability purposes at the state the level. We should not have a process that is so linear that getting that first goal achieved is dependent on the second. That is what we are now doing right now. We have all the secure kinds of procedures that have to take place in order for the state to make some judgment about what the school is doing and what it needs to do. Then you have released items as they are open to the world. Gene has asked Scott Trimble to think about this and our technology people to also think about it and he will be coming back to this table to talk with the committee further about their findings.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked if other states were working on this and are we working with those states?

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit advised that there are some states using technology, Kansas being one, Virginia is another. They are using it for multiple-choice purposes. In the short term, we may have to divide the reporting of multiple-choice and the open response. The military has a very robust system in place. IBM professional development program is fully based using technology. The goal is not to have results earlier but what you can do with results.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby has heard that anecdotally that we give to many tests. We need to concentrate on the learning component not on the test. He believes that a teacher will know who is struggling and that they do not need to wait for test results.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit felt that many teachers see too many irrelevant tests. If teachers feel the test provides valuable information and identifies student needs then they will use them. Gene still feels that some teachers feel that this is an external intrusion.

Gene Wilhoit has asked Scott Trimble to begin thinking about how to get Kentucky teachers scoring our assessment instead of contracting it out. There are multitude of other issues related to that, but what a wonderful professional development opportunity for our teachers this would be if we could get a cohort of 1,500 to 2000 teachers, retired teachers and university professors scoring our examinations.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton feels that we should continue to push on salary schedule. This should be linked to professional development and skill development. Robert is a little bit hopeful that this administration is philosophically interested in this at some point. We want some teachers working year around. We may want some teachers earning the same salary as some principals and this links right into that. This adds a real political component to justify revamping the salary schedule.

H.M. Snodgrass in terms costs teachers have four days of staff development every year. This could be a very effective way to use some teachers to get the experience and training in scoring the assessments.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit advised that we should not avoid paying teachers what we are already paying other people to do. Teachers should be fully compensated for this high level professional work. This should not be viewed as a way to save money, this is a shift of money.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield points out that there is a need for released items.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit asked the committee what they envision the end product to be. Conversation with the committee dealt with released items, items statistics on individual multiple-choice items and developing individually designed tests for ever student using a large item pool. Gene feels that this will require more up front item development.

Gene Wilhoit recognizes that there are a million problems but it is not insurmountable. Is there a better way to do this.

Gene Wilhoit began a conversation on the writing portfolio. He recognized that this committee has had a number of conversations on the writing assessment. Gene does not know at this time where we are going with that but we know it is an area of concern, particularly the writing portfolio. Gene does not feel the solution is to eliminate writing in the curriculum. How do we continue to have students writing in a very productive way and eliminate as many of the non-productive processes that are going on. Gene will be coming back to the committee with some suggestions, but they are not yet quite there.

Gene Wilhoit then began a conversation about the high school curriculum. The Board's attempt to provide greater learning results across the commonwealth was to prescribe a more rigorous high school curriculum. If you look at Kentucky's high school curricular requirements they pretty well align with every national recommendation in terms of the content descriptors of what is to be taught. There are some unresolved issues in mathematics.

Most students are learning at higher levels. We still have to many problems of the external product. Something is happening in that experience that is very different. It's possible that teachers are not prepared to teach the content at the level we are asking them to, or they are teaching a very different curriculum. They are defining that curriculum very different and the students are getting different experiences. How do we resolve this?

A concept that is being wrestled with is, would it helpful to the commonwealth to have end of course examinations in certain curricular areas? Those core program areas that everyone uses to measure success or failure of the student. There are certain language scales, do you know algebra, do you know geometry. Do you have a basic sense of United States history, and do you know the basics of science and biology. We could have the state invest in developing end of course exams. The tests could be used in many ways. We cannot have policy discussions until we have invested time in developing end of course exams. Gene asked for some direction from the members. His recommendation is that we would start in the area of mathematics.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton likes the idea of end of course examinations as an alternative to the high school graduation test that other states have. The end of course exams have the potential of being much more substantive and meaningful for kids and teachers. High school graduation tests are at best a 9<sup>th</sup> grade test.

Benny Lile advised the next issue is does the end of course exam become part of accountability.

Henry Ormsby indicated that the conversation has centered around students, teachers and schools which is the primary requirement. Politically you have to think outside of the school system. What we are doing here has a huge impact on how everyone values education. There are not enough people in the state that really have a high value of education. The way you communicate performance is in the test. This also has an impact on prospective teachers for joining the professional.

OEA staff comments:

Jerry Lunney pointed out that currently we have student accountability without student consequences. Having end of course exams could add student consequences.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby pointed out that if students do not pass, do not perform on the test, the public will not say it was their child's fault.

Linda Sheffield reminded everyone not to limit the mathematics end of course exams to just algebra and geometry. If we are going to attain NTCM standards or the rest of the worldwide standards we have to look at the whole integration of data analysis, probability



and number theory. We lose all that if we just concentrate on algebra and geometry. Mathematics has to be integrated as defined in NTCM standards.

OEA staff comments:

Jerry Lunney inquired if an alternative might be a requirement of universal use of the ACT in this state.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton pointed out that the ACT can not be used for this purpose. The company will not allow it.

Benny Lile asked the question of where does this go from here. Does this have a role in this legislative session? Does Gene see this committee being given specific charges to look at in the very near future?

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit responded that he only sees some general language asking schools to look at diagnosing kids and working with those kids and a reading initiative coming out of this legislative session. Gene has not seen any effort to redesign or redefine the current CATS assessment system. There is going to be reading on books but not enough money. This will not take them very far in this biennium. If the legislature is not able to resolve the budget issues, we may have to cut and redesign programs. Gene is hoping that we are able to resolve these issues as educators. We do not have to get into the correcting type of appeal.

We will be coming back to this committee with the learning compact conversation fairly soon, that is within the next couple of meetings. On assessment and accountability issues, we will probably deal with the issues incrementally. This is a longer term conversation.

Scott Trimble indicated that the compact is addressed in House Bill 193 so this is a bill to watch. The current assessment program is contracted through 2006. At some point in time we will be talking about a way to rethink the assessment and how we issue a new RFP {request for proposal}.

Gene Wilhoit indicated the time to revamp the testing program is in the 2004-2005 time period. The whole program could look very different. We could have instate scoring and our success in putting some of the processes that we want to put in place. We might go with a different contract relationship with instate people involved in this process.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton liked what Gene Wilhoit has done, in that you have in a quiet way seized the initiative on these issues. Is there some way to publicly seize that initiative so that the legislature would know that this type of thing was being discussed.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit asked if the group is agreeable to signoff on these areas that we intend to address.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised that he believes the membership would be willing to do this. The question is what we want it to look like. Benny said that Robert Sexton is right as longitudinal has been an issue, diagnostics been a issue, student accountability has been an issue and writing has been an issue. This begins to be proactive in all of those fronts.

Suzanne Guyer felt that the biggest danger we have tends to be In the trenches rumor mill. We need to communicate and put rumors to rest.

Margie Bradford thanked Gene Wilhoit and indicated that this was the first thing she has read that puts it all together. She is encouraged by what she has seen.

H.M. Snodgrass agreed that we can learn from what we have done and change is necessary. An operational analysis, a cost impact analysis needs to be performed so that you have an idea upfront what the costs to implement are going to be.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit advised that some the items can be done within current resources, but in some areas like technology things are not as well defined and a operational and cost analysis will be important.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile thanked the Commissioner and appreciated Gene taking the time to meet with the committee.

---

At 11:05 a.m. the committee began a morning break.

The meeting was reconvened at 11:18 a.m.

---

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile reconvened the meeting. Benny Lile confirmed that the next committee meeting will be March 12, 2004.

Other committee members agreed that this was a workable date.

<b>5</b>	<b>Update on NCLB Regulations</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
----------	-----------------------------------	----------------------

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble provided an update on the NCLB regulations. The regulations are moving forward but there are still some issues. The Board passed the full set of regulations that we brought this committee at the last meeting. The Board accepted recommendations from this committee.

There was a major item left open by the Board. A number of parties are interested in revisiting, rethinking, the sufficient size criteria. The size is the number of students that we require to view a particular subpopulation for calculating statistics related to whether or not you have met the goals for percent proficient or above or met the NCLB participation rate.

The current position is and what is in the regulation that was passed was in order for us to compare a subpopulation against the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for percent proficient and above in reading and/or mathematics, the school had to have ten (10) students in a particular grade and at least thirty (30) students of that particular subpopulation in the grades where NCLB assessments are currently administered. Participation rate is another issue. NCLB deals with students that you are not accountable for by simply requiring that they be tested. The criteria the Board approved to determine whether you met the 95% participation rate was that you had to have 10 students at each grade where NCLB assessments are administered and a total of 60 students at all grade levels that NCLB assessments are administered. The rationale is related to the notion that there are some cases where students are incapacitated. The Board has openly said that they will look for input at the January 23 hearing. There will be a public hearing January 23, 2004 where there may be input on this issue or any other issues related to the regulations. The Board has specifically stated that they are interested in hearing what people have to say about this particular issue. The implication has been made that the Board is willing to reconsider this.

The Local Superintendents Advisory Committee (LSAC) had two specific recommendations that the Board was interested in making sure that we looked at. A recommendation from LSAC was that the 10–30 rules that were described might be changed to 20-50 requiring that you have 20 students each grade level and 50 students in a subpopulation before comparisons are made against Annual Yearly Progress. LSAC

also asked that the 10-30 rule was rather arbitrary and may play out differently in large versus small schools. LSAC wanted the Department to look at a 15 percent kind of rule.

The Department has also looked at incremental changes to n-counts of 10–30 to 10-40, to 10-50 and to 10-60. With the 10-30 rule 477 schools were identified as not making Annual Yearly Progress in reading and/or mathematics. This is the rule for the NCLB results that were released on November 6, 2003. 420 of those were in reading and 396 in mathematics and some number were in both. A large number did not make AYP in both content areas. If this was changed to a 10-60 rule, the number would have dropped from 477 to 367 schools. The 20-50 rule was a little above 367 and 15% rule identified about the same number as the 10-30 rule. The data is still being quality controlled so the hard copy report is not quite ready for release.

There are some other issues that are being discussed. We are expecting input at the public hearing on January 23. One of the issues is what should the academic year be defined as. Scott Trimble advises that he has gotten some mixed messages from Washington on the issue of academic year. NCLB clearly states that if a student has not been a school for a full academic year, the school will not be held responsible for that student. And if the student has not been in a district for a full academic year, then the district will not be held accountable for the student. The non-accountable student is not included in the calculations against Annual Measurable Objects. The participation rate is designed to compensate for the students that are not in a school or district for a full academic year. While you are not accountable for them you still have to test them and report on them.

Another provision of NCLB that is difficult to figure out where Washington exactly comes down is that whatever definition you give to a full academic year has to apply to both your federal assessment accountability requirements and to your state. There is some debate as whether that is the case anymore. SCAAC has discussed this here and so has LSAC on whether or not we should apply the same criteria to both the state dimension of assessment and accountability as is applied to the federal. The State Board has decided to apply a single definition to both dimensions as the regulations currently stand. The definition of academic year that is written into the regulation is that a student needs to be in a school for 100 days prior to and including the first day of the school testing window. That does not mean that student has to be there the first day of the testing window, it means that if the student is there on the first day of the testing window the student is accountable to the school that the student was enrolled in for 100 days.

It is clear from Washington that we cannot have one definition for a particular subpopulation and another definition for other subpopulations. The same definition applies to district accountability and the regulations do provide for parallel district accountability system.

The other proposal from LSAC was a definition of academic year that would run from the sixth day of the school year through the last day of the testing window.

The State Board did not waiver on proficiency standards for reading or mathematics. There has been a debate on whether the standards for reading and mathematics should be changed to something different. For example redefining what the current proficient level is. Analysis has been run to find out what would happen were we to change the standard from proficient to something in the apprentice standard. Lowering the standard to apprentice level did not significantly impact the numbers provided under the current proficient standard. It lower the number of schools identified for not meeting AYP by approximately 30 schools. Quite often that seems contour intuitive to people as when you lower the standard it should make a much larger difference. Once you understand how subpopulations play in the federal accountability system, a single line of accountability is defined for all schools, all subpopulations. So no matter where you draw the line, particularly low performing subpopulations and the one most often ask about are students with disabilities tend to score below the line whether you set the standard at apprentice or proficient.

Going back to the n-count simulations when you raise the number of students in the subpopulation for AMO calculations you reduce the number of schools that are accountable for the specific subpopulation. That is how the 377 dropped to 367.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile summarized the actions this committee has taken on these issues. As everyone recalls on a full academic year, SCAAC is on record as supporting the 100 day as proposed. On the n-count SCAAC is on record as supporting the Department's recommendation. On the definition of proficiency SCAAC took this as a given and did not vote on. The fourth item that Scott Trimble has not mentioned was on the timely reporting. This committee debated this at length at our last meeting and had our technical people on the telephone. The recommendation from this group was to have dual reporting, not only this coming year but in subsequent years. Multiple choice in reading and mathematics reported early followed by the report of open response. At the last Board meeting the State Board voted to move the test window earlier by approximately one week in the school year and everyone would test in the one test window. This is not a regulation but a policy change.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that the testing window will be in mid April with the Spring 2005 window starting April 18<sup>th</sup>. There is only one testing window. The testing schedule follows the traditional spring break by one week. A single AYP decision testing window was needed to meet NCLB reporting before the beginning of the next school year.

SCAAC member comments:

H.M. Snodgrass asked about the change in the testing window.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble indicated that to score the reading and mathematics multiple choice and open response the testing window had to be changed as this was the only way to report

results could be back to schools by August 1. NCLB requires that we have AYP decisions back before school starts. Almost all schools start after August 1.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile reported his take on the decision. Benny reported that when he appeared before the Board, he spoke of the effort that had gone on to get multiple testing windows. Benny talked about this committees' conversation with the technical people and how they said that it could be as much as 90% plus agreement between multiple choice and open response. Benny's perception from a number of the board members were they were not willing to take the chance of miss-identifying schools. Miss-identifying 10% of the schools was too big of a chance to take.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble asked that these numbers be used with caution. While the high schools and elementary schools maybe 90% agreement, which is best case, middle schools are at 80% with the possibility of 20% of middle schools being miss-identified. These are true simulations and best case.

The process is that there is a public hearing on January 23. The Board at the February meeting will hear a summary from Kevin Nolan. The Board either accepts the hearing officer's recommendation, rejects it, or agrees to modify it. The Board will make it's final action, then the regulations go through EAARS and the legislative review process and becomes final the first part of April. These issues will be in affect this year, Spring 2004 testing, and are not retroactive to 2003.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked if the Board were to change the academic year definition will we go back to the baseline and make adjustments. Robert Sexton assumes the Department will.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that they probably will not.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass indicated that when the committee talked with the technical experts they indicated that some schools will get a bump and you just keep moving forward. You do not go back and recalculate everything in the past.

Robert Sexton said that means that a school with a lot of transient students would get a bump but a school without transient students would not.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble agreed and added the technical experts advised that we should document the impacted schools and move forward. This is the same advice we received from the technical experts in moving the testing window. The technical experts feel that the risks are higher in making technical adjustments than explaining the data.

For the 2003 reporting we have a waiver which says that our accountability procedures were the same as we have always used. The 100 day rule was not applied in 2003. In 2004 the academic year will apply to students who were there for 100 days. The 10-30 rule applies to students that were there for 100 days or more of the academic year. The 10-60 rule applies to students for participation calculations for students who are there on the first day of testing.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield asked how results will be reported for students where students do not meet the 100 day academic year and subpopulations that do not meet the 10-30 rule.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that he will be asked to produce data that suggests what the differences are based on the change in policy. The data will be reported back to the school.

House Bill 176 would establish the requirement that a school be accountable for all students who were in the school for 100 days or more prior to the day of testing window. Students who were not in a school for 100 days or more will roll up into a state accountability indexes. In Scott Trimble's judgment it does not make clear what happens to district accountability. One would have to assume that 100 days applies to the district as well.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield pointed out that there are 25 districts within 30 miles of each other and students do not stay in one district.

---

At 11:52 am p.m. the committee began a lunch break.

The meeting was reconvened at approximately 12:35 p.m.

---

<b>6. Writing Portfolio and On-Demand Writing Statistics</b>
--

<b>Scott Trimble</b>
----------------------

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile reconvened the meeting.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble began a discussion on the Writing Portfolio Audit and On-demand Writing. Three documents were included in the members packet which were:

1. Writing Portfolio and On-demand Writing pages from the state level Spring 2003 Kentucky Performance Report. The pages provide a distribution of scores by Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished results.
2. A chart summarizing performance judgment agreement rates for On-demand Writing and Writing Portfolio. The chart shows cross tabulations by grade level for the years 1999 through 2003. The first column of the chart provides the N,A,P,D distribution of On-Demand results. The second column is the Writing Portfolio results, The third column is the percent of students with exact agreement of performance on both On-demand Writing and the Writing Portfolio (e.g. students who scored proficient on On-demand Writing and also were scored proficient on the Writing Portfolio. The fourth column is the percent of students whose Writing Portfolio performance was equal to or within one score point on the On-demand writing. The chart attempts to summarize over 60 pages of cross tabs. The cross tabs are available if members are interested.
3. The Writing Portfolio state audit summary report for Spring 2003.

If one looks at the writing indexes we have seen an increase in the writing indexes. The writing indexes consist of 80% of writing portfolio data and 20% on-demand writing data. At the elementary level over the past five years (1999 – 2003) the index has increased from 52 to 68. There is a small increase at the middle school of 39 to 52. At the middle school students are scoring higher on the on-demand writing assessment than on the writing portfolio. Fifty seven percent (57%) of the students are apprentice and 18% proficient for on-demand writing. Writing portfolio student results are 46% apprentice and 16% proficient. Results at the elementary school and high school level are exactly opposite where performance on the writing portfolio is stronger. At the high school level the writing index by year starting in 1999 is 56, 55, 59, 60, and 64.

The writing portfolio is audited every year. Some of schools are selected randomly and some number of schools are selected purposeful. About 10,000 portfolios go through the audit process out of approximately 130,000 portfolios. The audit process is telling us that teachers are getting better at scoring the portfolios.

The findings for the Spring 2003 audit when one compares the original teacher scores with the final audit scores was that there is around a 70% exact agreement. This is reasonably and a little lower than what has been observed in the past several years. We did change contractors with this audit performed by CTB. Previous years, Data Recognition Corporation performed the audit under a subcontract to CTB. The first years of the audit were performed by what was then known as Advanced Systems in Measurement and Evaluation (ASME). The department sends a scoring accuracy team to the contractors site



to follow-up on their audit scoring team. The scoring accuracy team are Kentucky teachers from the writing portfolio advisory committee and have been involved in the writing portfolio process for a number of years. What we have seen in past audits is that Kentucky scoring accuracy team have scored more stringent than the contractor audit scorers. In this audit at the twelfth grade the Kentucky scoring accuracy team were in between the scores assigned by teachers and the scores assigned by the contractor audit scores. While Scott Trimble is not concerned with this reversal, he wanted the committee to be aware of this.

For the Spring 2003 audit a number of key factors are in the audit. The school selection process was changed to select an equal number of high schools, middle schools and elementary schools. In previous years the selection process did not audit as many high schools students. This had an impact on the audit as the number of high school students has been a very low percentage of the 10,000 students. To verify the accuracy of the audit across years, a set of portfolios called "check sets" that are a series of portfolios that the writing advisory committee has agreed upon the score. The check sets are seeded into the audit process and the audit process pretty much agreed. The contractor audit scores score the check sets correctly 80% of the time which is a reasonable expectation from this process. Scott Trimble is confident that the audit was done correctly and reasonably consistent with what has happened in past years. The audit tells us that the trend data is pretty consistent over time. The audit process has a tendency to lower distinguished and proficient scores more so than that of apprentice and novice scores. In some ways that is to be expected and in other ways it is a problem. In the scoring process and the instructional process we are not recognizing this work as well as we should.

Jennifer Bernard agrees with Scott Trimble. Yesterday Jennifer Bernard was at a writing portfolio audit school. The teachers were concerned about their audit scores. They were having difficulty in reconciling the audit scores with the original scores. The teachers were particularly concerned about the distinguished scores being lowered. Jennifer and the SCAC members had looked at over 30 student portfolios that were sent in for review. We agreed with all the audit scores. Across the state teachers are so familiar with their student's, their student's ability, and their student's thinking ability that they equate thinking ability with writing ability. The student demonstrates distinguished thinking they make an automatic assumption that the student is going to write in a distinguished manner. In actuality that is not true. Once the teachers understood they realized that there were instructional implications. They need to help their students become better communicators.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield asked about the exact agreement rate in appendix J of the writing portfolio audit report. The percentage of exact agreement rate between original and final audit scores is about 71 percent. Kay wanted to know if this percentage was good indicate or should be more?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that he would like to see it higher. Seventy percent is not bad when a Kentucky school is compared against the state standard under audit conditions. We have a problem with a school that has 20% agreement. Under controlled conditions the auditors were able to agree with the state standards 80 percent of the time.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked if the data in this years audit was similar to past years audits?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble indicated that it was with the exception of the grade 12 scoring that was discussed earlier.

Cherry Boyle reinforced the selection change in random and purposeful.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile over the past years has heard very few arguments about the audit process and the validity of the audit process. The main concern is the lowering of the distinguished and proficient scores. He referred committee members to page 28 of the report which showed at grade 7 combined that 91 distinguished portfolios were lowered to 2 and 756 proficient portfolios were lowered to 294. People are approaching Benny Lile about the schools that are not getting audited. Of the schools that were audited, the aggregate scores were lowered by 14 index points. Should all of the schools in the state have their scores lowered by 14 index points? If a school at the middle school level has 10 students with a distinguished portfolio, should that be lowered to one distinguished student? This has been true over the past three years.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble believes this is a tough question as one could argue on the random selection schools one would see a similar performance across the state. He understands the concern but does not believe a policy could be enforced to automatically lower everyone's writing index.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile added that he was not suggesting to lower non audited school scores.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby asked about the purpose of the audit.

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles responded that the primary purpose is it to confirm the accuracy of scoring by schools and to provide instructional feedback to schools on scoring. Department writing staff will have conversations and meet with schools so that schools can take corrective action when scores are lowered. Schools can have their student's writing portfolios sent to the Kentucky Department of Education for annotations.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield asked if school scores are looked at in the following year to see if scoring has improved.

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles indicated that some schools have been audited two years in row and while she does not have exact statistics, the scores went up and the exact agreement rates also went up.

Scott Trimble added that there is insufficient resources to go back and follow-up on schools who are part of the audit. It is only by chance that a school is picked two years in a row.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills pointed out that there are different operational processes in how schools score the portfolios. At their high school all teachers score portfolios, not just the language arts teachers. At their elementary school level, P-3 through 5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers score. At the middle school, teachers at the 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade score. Have we looked at the different grade levels to see scoring results?

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles advised that type of data has never been collected. That is something that the Legislative Research Commission staffers talked about last year suggesting an exit interview. At the school level schools identify their teams. They report to us who their cluster leaders are as they are the ones who go through all of the training. The schools work with the district central office to structure how the scoring is handled. Scoring can be very different from one school to another and from one district to another. We can not tell you which systems are used and which works better.

Teachers when scoring do have difficulties removing themselves from a student that they have worked with all year long and in some cases for more than one year. The writing staff talks with schools about options to avoid teachers scoring their own students portfolios. The department recommends that you never limit portfolio scoring to just language arts teachers.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked about the development process of students and their portfolios. Is there any formal plan about time spent and appropriate practices in developing the writing portfolio?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that Cherry Boyles and Jennifer Bernhard could better speak to the training issue. Unless there is an allegation, which goes to Kevin Nolan's office, there is not additional follow-up.

Cherry Boyles points out that there are several regulations that govern the development of a writing portfolio entry. One is a massive document that gives time saving information from word processing to conferring in the classroom. We have one regulation that deals with the type of reading materials teachers should use when assigning certain types of writing. The writing staff does some development work. There is not as much face-to-face training since the elimination of the regional service centers. We have development issues that we continue to share with cluster leaders placing them in the role of the instructional leader of writing in their building. There is an electronic message system that was started this year. Cluster leaders share instructional ideas, development information with other teachers in their building. The writing staff can no longer do regularly scheduled training sessions as the staff has been reduced from eleven to three. There is the development handbook and there are tools that are shared with cluster leaders.

SCAAC member comments:

Suzanne Guyer advises that the universal issue that is the ongoing complaint of everyone is the writing portfolio issue and the amount of time spent. Our teachers know that it should be embedded, but if you are a 4<sup>th</sup> grade science teacher you can not afford to take three weeks out of science instruction to write a transactive piece several times during the year in science. School leadership wants students at the proficient level on the writing portfolio. Suzanne then described how money is being spent to accomplish this. It takes an inordinate amount of time conferencing with students. The issue is can we justify the time spent and the money invested when the writing portfolio only represents 11% of the accountability index. Suzanne is not arguing about the value of a good writer.

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles advised that there is not a good vertical alignment between elementary and middle schools. The students are not bringing much with them, not even the language

SCAAC member comments:

Suzanne Guyer feels that teachers are not getting the breadth of experience. Teachers would like to have a working folder and not do a complete portfolio in grade 4. Suzanne described the process and students and teachers go through to develop a portfolio, which is a very labor intensive process requiring students to spend weeks writing. This is taking a lot of instructional time from other curriculum. Suzanne is not arguing about the value of a good writer.

Teachers would prefer a working folder where at each grade level students add a couple of pieces to the folder each year.

Kay Freeland indicated that she has gotten feedback from college students. They have not written a piece in college instead have used their high school portfolio pieces. These students have done very well.

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles advised that the writing team met with university professors. The professors want to help. University professors are beginning to say that students are starting to come with the necessary skills. The professors are concerned about writing if the assessment is changed.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile concerns are what can we do come February and March when schools begin to prepare for the test and emphasis on the portfolio is getting worse?

Robert Sexton was curious to know why 73% of the gifted and talented students are scoring novice on-demand writing?

Kay Freeland indicated that not all gifted and talented students are identified cognitively in writing. The student might be identified in the humanities, in art, or in music.

Robert Sexton pointed out for the record that the gap between males and females is considerably bigger in most cases between Whites and African Americans. – do not know how to talk about

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles agreed that over time the gender GAP continues to increase as students advance to higher grade levels. Kentucky is a picture of the nation.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills feels that we should be looking at writing alternatives that take the stress level off of the students and the teachers.

Benny Lile reminded members that SCAAC early on had sub committees to study different assessment and accountability issues. Do we want to form a subcommittee to address writing? No one wants to get away from writing. Everyone wants to continue with a writing assessment.

Kay Freeland raised the issue that should we expect every student be a distinguished writer. She did not think that this is a realistic expectation and other members nodded in agreement. The key requirement is having students writing at the proficient level.

Margie Bradford pointed out that in the information we ask students to read, will the students know what proficient writing is, and will they be able to recognize distinguished writing?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble asked Cherry Boyles and Jennifer Bernhard to identify some schools where things are working well.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile is forming an ad-hoc subcommittee to continue looking into writing. The subcommittee will be composed of three or four members.

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles shared with the committee that the University Writing Project Directors across the state have recently taken on a school writing project. They have teachers who have served as teacher consultants to the writing project who have been trained to be facilitators of the school study. The school study was written by AEL. It is based on research and was used several years ago. They are looking for schools where they can begin to have their facilitators work with school teams to do a study with the writing program. It is not a portfolio study but a writing program study. If members have worked with schools or are aware of schools that might be interested then have schools contact writing staff at KDE or directly contact the writing project directors in their area. This is not a Department of Education study.

<b>8. 703 KAR 5:040 – Accountability for Students A1-A6</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
---	----------------------

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that Cindy Owen will provide the presentation.

Cindy Owen brought the committee up-to-date on the accountability regulation for students who are attending A3, A5 and A6 schools. An amended regulation is being sent to the Kentucky Board of Education. There is one particular school, and there may be others through out the state, that feel that even though they are not a A1 {regular} school they feel that their enrollment is large enough and their population is stable enough to allow them to have their own indexes and be treated for accountability as an A1 school. The regulation is amended to allow these schools to be accountable. These schools will be called final schools of placement as the intent is that the student will finish school there. The student is assigned there on a non-temporary basis as there is no intent to transition the student back to an A1 school. Jefferson County has one of these schools.

There has been great conversation about who should be accountable for the scores of students who attend non A1 schools. No one seemed to have a problem of having the scores come back to the A1 school when the A1 school responsible for the student or the district assigns the student to the non A1 school. This remains the same in the regulation.

There is not agreement when another authority like the courts or juvenile justice made the assignment and strictly out of the hands of the A1 school or the district. Once the student is placed in an A3, A5, or A6 facility, the question will be asked prior to that placement was the student in an A1 school for a full academic year. If the student was, then the scores will go back to the A1 school as the A1 school should have influenced the student's performance on the assessment.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked for a clarification of the academic year as the year before or the year of.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded the academic year is the year of. When the placement is made the question will be asked has the student been in an A1 school for a full academic year.

If the student has not been in the A1 school for a full academic year, then the student scores will be rolled up to the state. There will be a committee formed of people from the Kentucky Department of Education, the court system, juvenile justice and others who work with these students to represent these students. The committee will report to the Kentucky Board of Education, keeping the Board informed on student performance and issues.

Jefferson Co asked for another change to the regulation and which may be applicable to other districts. Dr. Daschener brought up that when a student is in a private school and the student leaves because of disciplinary problems and they are enrolled in Jefferson Co. Because Jefferson Co knows the disciplinary history of the student. The student may be immediately enrolled to a A5 school. Jefferson Co does not want to jeopardize the safety of other students by placing the student in a A1 school. Dr Daschener also sighted examples where he as superintendent has placed students in an A5 setting while the student moves through the court system. An example is a student who brings a gun to school. Dr. Daschener feels that these students should be accountable back to the district and not to the A1 school since the A1 school did not have an opportunity to make the decision. The regulation has been amended to say that if a district places a student after they consult with the court system, and there is formal documentation that this was a decision, then the data for the student will be assigned to the district.

What is not written in the regulation is an accountability model for A3, A5 and A6 schools. Another office with the KDE is working on that regulation. The accountability model will be unique to the services offered to the student by the school. For example one of the indicators of success might be reducing the number of dropouts. There is a document that has been used for technical assistance on the WEB for A5 schools that is similar to the standards and indicators document for regular schools.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby asked for a definition of a A5 school.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded that an A5 school is an alternative school that usually houses at-risk students for behavior, dropout, things like that. An A6 school is a day treatment center and an A3 school is for special education students.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked when this regulation would become effective.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded that the regulation will go to the Kentucky Board of Education in February for a reading. If the Board accepts the amendments then the regulation will come back to the Board in April for a second reading. Then it will take about six (6) months for the regulation to take affect.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby asked about students who are housed in court assigned lockdown detention centers like the Rowan Co facilities that were discussed in the November meeting. Who is responsible for the education of these students?

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen answered that the district housing the detention facility is responsible for providing education. For accountability the students will be either accountable back to the A1 school if in that school for a full academic year or to the state.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile remembered that approximately four years ago this committee had a large discussion around A2-A6 students. Not schools but students; namely foster students. This would be a good time to revisit as this regulation is being opened up and looked at. Currently those students are set back to where they would be in school were they not in a foster situation. Same issue. It is very difficult for schools and districts to track these students. Some you never find. Others may have never set foot in the school district. They were born there, the legal father and mother live there, the student has not set foot in the school and as eighth graders the scores go back to the middle school. This is illogical. Right now, that is the way it works. Districts pick and choose. The school will keep the scores of a foster child that is a good student and has been in the school for four years. A foster child that has been at the school for a year that is a trouble maker and does not try is tracked back. Benny feels that if the student meets the academic year then the school should be accountable for them.

Henry Ormsby agrees with Benny.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen advised that the 100 day academic year rule supercedes what has transpired in the past. This will not be effective in time for Spring 2004 testing.



SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland commended Cindy Owen for looking into A2-A6 the situation. The goal of school districts is to graduate these students. In Rowan Co they have only been able to graduate two students in twelve years. Kay Freeland pointed out that when funding cuts came through those funds were also cut in juvenile justice.

Benny Lile hopes that if the Kentucky Board of Education adopts this, there may be a way to implement the regulation for Spring 2004 accountability. If the 100 day rule goes through for Spring 2004 this will cause a blip, this is going to cause a blip, all being much smaller, still a blip. Benny feels that it is better to get the blips dealt with as soon as possible and go into affect this year.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble pointed out that data has been looked at and the current policy is not working.

<b>7</b>	<b>NCLB Results</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
----------	---------------------	----------------------

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble reported on the NCLB results. Scott advised that he had already covered some of the NCLB results when the committee talked about the regulations so will keep this short. 477 schools were identified as not making Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading, mathematics, or both. The regulation is written that if 420 schools do not make AYP in reading in 2004, then federal consequences kick in. There are 396 schools that will be in federal consequences if in 2004 they do make AYP in mathematics. Our regulation is written to define reading or mathematics as opposed to the full conjunctive model.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked how many of the 470 did not make it because they did not meet our accountability index. How many did not make it just because of disability?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble did not know the exact number. However 202 failed to make it because of our criteria but also a number failed to make it on other criteria as well. Scott agreed to pull out the data.

7	<b>Status of NCLB Required Reading and Mathematics questions, grades 3-8 -- Augmented NRT</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
---	---	----------------------

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that the department is in final contract negotiations as to how to implement augmented NRT in grades three through eight, the additional NCLB required assessments. At this time Scott preferred to not discuss until the negotiations were complete.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked about the status of the field test that is planned for this fall?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that the plan is to have the field test this fall and we are very close on timelines. We are very close to missing the timelines but it is still currently doable this fall. The intent is to field test this fall and go operational in the Spring of 2005 and begin to use this as longitudinal data in 2006. We are planning to have new CTBS/6 national norms for Spring 2005 administration. This model allows for rotation of various forms of the NRT for 2005, 2006 and beyond. We will not be using the same NRT items. Again this is dependent on completion of contract negotiations.

Scott Trimble gave his thoughts on how longitudinal reporting might happen starting in spring 2006.

**ADJOURNMENT**

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised that since there is no longer a member quorum, there cannot be a motion to adjourn the meeting. Benny Lile ended the meeting at 2:20 p.m.